arXiv:1302.5096v3 [hep-th] 21 Apr 2013

Bigravity in Kuchař's Hamiltonian formalism.
2. The special case

Vladimir O. Soloviev[a] and Margarita V. Tchichikina[b]
[a]*Institute for High Energy Physics, 142 281, Protvino, Moscow region, Russia*
e-mail: Vladimir.Soloviev@ihep.ru
[b]*Moscow State University, 119 899, Moscow, Russia*
e-mail: chich@goa.bog.msu.ru

April 23, 2013

Abstract

In the first part of this work (arXiv:1211.6530) it was shown that the Hamiltonian formalism of bigravity with the ultralocal potential of a general form, under some conditions imposed on the potential, had 4 first class constraints and their algebra was the algebra of hypersurface deformations. In this article we suppose that the potential also satisfies a special degeneracy condition suggested by de Rham, Gabadadze, Tolley (dRGT), and derive the constraint algebra of the bigravity and the massive gravity. In contrast to most works in this field we do not use neither the explicit form of the dRGT potential nor the Hassan-Rosen transformation of variables, but follow some kind of axiomatic approach. Also we prefer Kuchař's Hamiltonian formulation which involve embedding variables to avoid any noncovariance. For the bigravity we get 4 second class constraints, as one degree of freedom is included into the phase space in addition to 12 standard ones. Given the presence of 4 first class constraints, total number of the gravitational degrees of freedom in bigravity occurs 7, and in the massive gravity it is 5.

1 Introduction

Despite the fact that the General Relativity (GR) for a very long time stands as a Standard Model of gravity, a lot of efforts is undertaken to provide its generalizations, and the bigravity theory is one of them. N. Rosen [1] was probably the first who coined the term "bimetric" and who advocated a theory of gravitation with two spacetime metrics, one of them was a non-dynamical, i.e. a background one. Later dynamics for the second metric was introduced [2], at first such a theory was called "f-g gravity" or "strong gravity". The terms "bigravity" and "multigravity" appeared in works by J. Kogan and his collaborators [3] where this theory was motivated by the boom of extra-dimentional models from the theory side and by the newly found effect of acceleration in the Universe expansion from the side of experiment. It was shown that in bigravity there were two gravitational fields, one of them was massless and the other was massive. The massive gravity is a long standing challenge for theoreticians. Here S. Deser stays an outstanding and permanent sceptic [4]. In a recent article Deser and Waldron [5] claim that even if a theory is ghostless, then it is acasual. Also we were reminded [5] that this field of research had a rather long history, and remarkably, even the most fashionable variant of massive gravity [6] was discussed more than 40 years ago [7]. Nevertheless we hope that there is some space for the bigravity. Both the bigravity, and massive gravity seem to be able to explain the accelerated expansion of the Universe, and this is discussed in many papers, see, for example, Ref. [8].

We think that the de Rham-Gabadadze-Tolley (dRGT) model [6] of massive gravity and Hassan-Rosen model of bigravity [9] are very interesting and deserve a thorough study. In particular, it is necessary to obtain a more transparent analysis of its canonical structure, including finding all the constraints, calculation of their algebra, classification of these constraints and fixing the number of degrees of freedom. Obviously a lot of articles with this work have already been published, we mention only a few [9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15], but the problem is difficult due to the complexity and bulkiness of the proposed derivations coming from the nontrivial form of the potential with the matrix square root.

Let us point out three special features of our method. First, we intend to use the benefits of covariant Hamiltonian approach by Kuchař [16], which takes into account, in contrast to the famous ADM approach [17], not only metrics, but also variables describing embedding of a state hypersurface into the spacetime. This allows to vary spacetime coordinates and metric components in the $3+1$-basis independently. Let us mention that in bigravity we have two such bases. Second, we expect that a careful study of bigravity will also lead to better understanding of the massive gravity, i.e. of a theory with only one dynamical metric. Third, the plan of this article is to replace the cumbersome calculations with the dGRT potential by working with a general potential with some axiomatic requirements imposed on it. There are two kinds of matter present in formalism, each one interacts (the coupling is minimal) with its own metric, and our main results do not depend on the concrete form of the matter Lagrangians. We divided our work in two parts calling them as the general case and the special case of bigravity.

In the first part of this work [18] we obtained the conditions which potential of a general form $\tilde{U}(u, u^i, \eta_{ij}, \gamma_{ij})$ should satisfy in order to have 4 first class constraints. The second class constraints were used for a construction of Dirac brackets. In these brackets the algebra of first class constraints was the celebrated algebra of hypersurface deformations (see ADM [17] and Dirac [19]). In counting a number for gravitational degrees of freedom we started from a number 12 for two induced metric components η_{ij}, γ_{ij} and subtracted 4 as a number of first class constraints $\mathcal{R}$, $\mathcal{R}_i$, so getting 8 as a number of free canonically conjugate pairs of variables. This corresponded to one massless and one massive gravitational fields, massive one there contained a ghost degree of freedom.

In this article, which is the second part of our work considered as a whole, we put new restrictions on the potential function in order to meet properties of the dRGT potential. Namely, in article [18] it was supposed that matrix of second derivatives of the potential over variables u, u^i was nondegenerate. Here we require that this matrix is degenerate and has rank 3. At the same time the potential is to fulfill conditions, found in Ref. [18], which are necessary for the existence of first class constraint algebra, and one new condition on the potential is found in this work.

To compare our results with the results of other groups one should have in mind some difference in terminology. First, we call the theory of two dynamical metrics as bigravity, following earlier work [3], while some authors call it as bimetric theory [20]. Second, we start with treating the lapse and shift as canonical variables, so our primary constraints are written as conditions that the momenta conjugate to lapse and shift are equal to zero. Some authors start with admitting that lapse and shift are Lagrangian multipliers and so do not have conjugate momenta at all. Therefore they call our secondary constraints as primary ones, and our tertiary constraint as a secondary one. At last, as we start with a wider set of gravitational canonical variables, so we finish with a wider set of constraints. The additional pair of constraints include one primary and one quaternary constraint which are absent in most other publications. The reason for this is that our additional pair of canonical variables is replaced by one variable treated as nondynamical, and so our primary constraint is absent, whereas our quaternary one is understood as an equation fixing this nondynamical variable.

Really, there are at least three different algorithms which allow to come to the results. The first one is to construct Dirac brackets on the base of the set of second class constraints. It is suitable that this set is not necessary to be complete. The second method is to use more Lagrangian multipliers, but work with the Poisson brackets. And the third way is to solve the second class constraints (may be implicitly) and express some variables as functions of the reduced set of canonical variables. We pay most attention to the first method, i.e. in the main text we work with the Dirac brackets, but one can see in short how other methods work in Appendices.

In contrast to the general case studied in article [18], as here the potential has the declared above new properties, one of the secondary constraints $\mathcal{S}$, as well as one of the primary constraints π_u, change their role, and drop out of the primary set of second class constraints (the secondary set arises at the end). Therefore, only 6 constraints $\pi_{u^i}, \mathcal{S}_i$ are here involved in the construction of the nontrivial Dirac brackets. Then we stand with 6 other constraints π_u, $\mathcal{S}$, $\mathcal{R}$, $\mathcal{R}_i$, and are to study their algebra in the Dirac brackets. The calculations show that two brackets $\{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{R}\}_{\tilde{D}}$, $\{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{S}\}_{\tilde{D}}$ look as nonzero on the surface of the given constraints. For the first bracket this nonzero result leads also to the nonzero bracket $\mathcal{S}, \mathrm{H}_{\tilde{D}}$. In order to preserve constraint $\mathcal{S}$ in the process of Hamiltonian evolution we should treat this result as appearance of a new constraint Ω. This is the celebrated “secondary constraint” of Refs. [9, 13]. In its turn this constraint has, at first sight, a nonzero Dirac bracket with the primary constraint π_u present in the Hamiltonian (and so depends on unwanted variable u), whereas this bracket remarkably weakly coincides with $\{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{S}\}_{\tilde{D}}$. Let us remind that at first, in article by Kluson [12], it had been claimed that the last bracket is nonzero, but later it was proved [13] that this bracket was zero for the dRGT potential. Here we prove this zero, and this is crucial in order to get 7 gravitational degrees of freedom for the bigravity and 5 for the massive gravity. We acknowledge that this result, missing in the first version of this work [21], has been inspired by article [22].

The content of this article is as follows.

In Section 2 the notations and results of our previous article [18] are reminded.

In Section 3 we outline in brief properties of the dRGT potential, interpret the dRGT conditions in our variables, and discuss consequences of these conditions. The 8×8 matrix of Poisson brackets between 8 constraints, considered in Ref. [18] as nondegenerate, now becomes degenerate, consequences of this fact are analyzed, and the Dirac brackets are derived for the canonical variables.

The results of Dirac brackets calculations between 6 constraints $\mathcal{R}$, $\mathcal{R}_i$, π_u, $\mathcal{S}$ are given in Section 4.

In Section 5 the mathematical results on Monge-Ampère equation are applied, the crucial identity $\Theta^i = 0$ is proved, and the Hassan-Rosen transformation is commented.

Section 6 contains discussion of quaternary constraint Ψ and Table 2 for Dirac brackets between all constraints. The number of gravitational degrees of freedom is proved to be 7.

In Section 7 we discuss the massive gravity, i.e. a theory with only one dynamical metric, whereas the second one is a given solution of GR equations. In that case there are no constraints $\mathcal{R}$, $\mathcal{R}_i$ and the Hamiltonian is nonzero. Primary constraint π_u is to be included into the Hamiltonian with a corresponding Lagrangian multiplier. Secondary constraint $\mathcal{S}$ is not necessary to be included as it appears automatically to guarantee a preservation of the primary one in evolution. In its turn to preserve the secondary constraint it is necessary to introduce a tertiary one $\tilde{\Omega}$. This is a bit different from Ω which appears in bigravity because it depends on background fields N, N^i and η_{ij}. As in the bigravity case $\tilde{\Omega}$ also have zero Dirac bracket with π_u. The Dirac bracket $\{\tilde{\Omega}, \mathcal{S}\}$ is nonzero, so both constraints are second class. The quaternary constraint arises as a condition to preserve the tertiary constraint in Hamiltonian evolution. The tertiary constraint does not commute with the primary one in Dirac brackets, so the Lagrangian multiplier may be fixed by the requirement of preservation of the tertiary constraint. This gives 5 gravitational degrees of freedom for the massive gravity.

The Conclusion contains a complete list of conditions imposed on the potential in this article, and our short comments on the related works appeared after publication of the first part of this work.

We prefer in this article to use the same notations as in work [18]. In particular, for indices running from 1 to 3 we use small Greek letters, for indices running from 0 to 3 – small Latin ones, spacetime metrics $f_{\mu\nu}$ and $g_{\mu\nu}$ have signature $- + ++$. When the same letter is used for analogous quantities constructed with the first or with the second metric, then upper bar refers to the second one, i.e. $g_{\mu\nu}$. We significantly exploit here results obtained in the first article [18] and refer to its formulas in the following way: (I.11) means Eq. (11) of article [18].

2 Kuchař's approach in bigravity

As it is in more detail presented in article [18], the bigravity action is a sum of two GR action copies, each given with its own matter as a source of gravity, minus a potential

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}^{(f)} + \mathcal{L}^{(g)} - \sqrt{-f}U(f_{\mu\nu}, g_{\mu\nu}). \tag{1}$$

$$\mathcal{L}^{(f)} = \frac{1}{16\pi G^{(f)}}\sqrt{-f}f^{\mu\nu}R^{(f)}_{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{L}^{(f)}_M(\psi^A, f_{\mu\nu}), \tag{2}$$

$$\mathcal{L}^{(g)} = \frac{1}{16\pi G^{(g)}}\sqrt{-g}g^{\mu\nu}R^{(g)}_{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{L}^{(g)}_M(\phi^A, g_{\mu\nu}), \tag{3}$$

where f, g are determinants of the first and second spacetime metrics, $R^{(f)}_{\mu\nu}$, $R^{(g)}_{\mu\nu}$ are their Ricci tensors, $G^{(f)}$, $G^{(g)}$ are the gravitational constants, $\mathcal{L}^{(f)}_M$, $\mathcal{L}^{(g)}_M$ are Lagrangians of the first and second matter, A are abstract indices for these matter fields. The potential

$$\sqrt{-f}U(f_{\mu\nu}, g_{\mu\nu}), \tag{4}$$

having dimension m^4, is constructed as an ultralocal function of tensor $Y^{\mu}_{\alpha} = g^{\mu\nu}f_{\nu\alpha}$ combined of the two spacetime metrics. Then the Hamiltonian of bigravity is also a sum of two copies of GR Hamiltonian plus the potential ultralocally depending on components of 3 + 1-decomposition of the two metrics. In the Kuchař approach [16, 23], where embedding variables $X^{\mu} = e^{\mu}(\tau, x^i)$ are involved in addition to metric, this is done with the help of basis (n^{μ}, e^{μ}_i). Here $e^{\mu}_i = \partial X^{\mu}/\partial x^i$ are tangential vectors to the spatial hypersurface of state, and vector n^{μ} is a unit normal to the hypersurface (future directed). There are two metrics in bigravity, and so we are able to construct two future directed unit normals, and respectively two bases.

When decomposing a metric in its own basis we get 6 independent components representing the induced metric on the given hypersurface, but when decomposing it in another basis we get 4 additional components. We take as a default basis constructed with the help of first metric $f_{\mu\nu}$:

$$\begin{aligned} f^{\mu\nu} &= -n^\mu n^\nu + \eta^{ij} e^\mu_i e^\nu_j, && (5) \\ g^{\mu\nu} &= g^{\perp\perp} n^\mu n^\nu + g^{i\perp}(e^\mu_i n^\nu + e^\nu_i n^\mu) + \gamma^{ij} e^\mu_i e^\nu_j, && (6) \end{aligned}$$

in another basis denoted as $(\bar{n}^\mu, e^\mu_i)$, all formulas are changed

$$\begin{aligned} g^{\mu\nu} &= -\bar{n}^\mu \bar{n}^\nu + \gamma^{ij} e^\mu_i e^\nu_j, && (7) \\ f^{\mu\nu} &= f^{\perp\perp} \bar{n}^\mu \bar{n}^\nu + f^{i\perp}(e^\mu_i \bar{n}^\nu + e^\nu_i \bar{n}^\mu) + \eta^{ij} e^\mu_i e^\nu_j, && (8) \end{aligned}$$

in the same time both induced metrics $\eta_{ij} = f_{\mu\nu} e^\mu_i e^\nu_j \quad \gamma_{ij} = g_{\mu\nu} e^\mu_i e^\nu_j$ stay unchanged. As usual, contravariant tensors are inverse matrices $\eta_{ij}\eta^{jk} = \delta^k_i$, $\gamma_{ij}\gamma^{jk} = \delta^k_i$. The matter fields are to be given by their components of $3+1$-decomposition too. Time is given by parameter τ, monotonically numerating hypersurfaces and not by coordinate X^0 in contrast to the ADM notations. The components of this time vector field

$$N^\mu = \frac{\partial X^\mu}{\partial \tau} = N n^\mu + N^i e^\mu_i \equiv \bar{N} \bar{n}^\mu + \bar{N}^i e^\mu_i, \tag{9}$$

are called lapse and shift. In ADM approach where the embedding variables are not used only one coordinate system X^μ is at work, and so these functions are given as components of spacetime metric in the coordinate basis

$$\bar{N} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g^{00}}}, \quad \bar{N}_i = g_{0i}, \quad N = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-f^{00}}}, \quad N_i = f_{0i}. \tag{10}$$

In order to transform from Kuchař's notations to ADM we are to take

$$\tau = X^0, \qquad x^i = X^i, \tag{11}$$

then

$$N^\mu = \delta^\mu_0, \qquad e^\mu_i = \delta^\mu_i. \tag{12}$$

Exploiting (n^μ, e^μ_i) as a default basis to make calculations easier we replace 4 components of the second metric by functions u, u^i:

$$u = \frac{1}{\sqrt{-g^{\perp\perp}}}, \qquad u^i = -\frac{g^{\perp i}}{g^{\perp\perp}}, \tag{13}$$

having the simple geometric meaning: u is an inverse of a norm (calculated in the second metric) of vector n^α, constructed as a unit normal (in the first metric) to the hypersurface, and u^i are three projections (calculated in the second metric) of coordinate basis vectors onto this unit normal

$$u = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|g^{\mu\nu} n_\mu n_\nu|}}, \qquad u^i = \frac{g^{\mu\nu} n_\mu e^i_\nu}{\sqrt{|g^{\mu\nu} n_\mu n_\nu|}}. \tag{14}$$

Then

$$\bar{N} = uN, \qquad \bar{N}^i = N^i + u^i N, \tag{15}$$

and in general case studied in Ref. [18] the bigravity Hamiltonian takes a following form [1]

$$\mathrm{H} = \int d^3x \left(N\mathcal{R} + N^i \mathcal{R}_i \right). \tag{16}$$

Here expressions

$$\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{H} + u\bar{\mathcal{H}} + u^i \bar{\mathcal{H}}_i + \tilde{U}, \tag{17}$$

$$\mathcal{R}_i = \mathcal{H}_i + \bar{\mathcal{H}}_i, \tag{18}$$

are first class constraints satisfying in Dirac brackets the well-known hypersurface deformation algebra [19]

$$\{\mathcal{R}(x), \mathcal{R}(y)\}_D = \Big(\eta^{ik}(x)\mathcal{R}_k(x) + \eta^{ik}(y)\mathcal{R}_k(y) \Big)\, \delta_{,i}(x,y), \tag{19}$$

$$\{\mathcal{R}_i(x), \mathcal{R}_k(y)\}_D = \mathcal{R}_i(y)\delta_{,k}(x,y) + \mathcal{R}_k(x)\delta_{,i}(x,y), \tag{20}$$

$$\{\mathcal{R}_i(x), \mathcal{R}(y)\}_D = \mathcal{R}(x)\delta_{,i}(x,y). \tag{21}$$

The Dirac brackets were derived in article [18] by inverting matrix of Poisson brackets for 8 second class constraints:

$$\pi_u = 0, \quad \pi_{u^i} = 0, \quad \bar{\mathcal{H}} + \frac{\partial \tilde{U}}{\partial u} = 0, \quad \bar{\mathcal{H}}_i + \frac{\partial \tilde{U}}{\partial u^i} = 0. \tag{22}$$

The first quartet of them arises as primary constraints, and the second one as secondary. The lapse and shift functions, as in GR, are Lagrangian multipliers standing before the first class constraints. In this work, as in [18], we admit that the potential $\tilde U = \sqrt{\eta} U(u, u^i, \eta_{ij}, \gamma_{ij})$ fulfills the following conditions

---

[1] To be pedantic we should first introduce momenta conjugate to N and N^i, and then the primary constraints saying these momenta are really zero. So, constraints $\mathcal{R}$, $\mathcal{R}_i$ arise as the secondary ones. The removal of these lapse and shift variables with their momenta from the list of canonical variables looks as a gauge, see [I.27]

$$Q^i_k \equiv 2\eta_{jk}\frac{\partial \tilde U}{\partial \eta_{ij}} + 2\gamma_{jk}\frac{\partial \tilde U}{\partial \gamma_{ij}} - u^i\frac{\partial \tilde U}{\partial u^k} - \delta^i_k \tilde U = 0, \tag{23}$$

$$Q^\ell \equiv 2u^j\gamma_{jk}\frac{\partial \tilde U}{\partial \gamma_{k\ell}} - u^\ell u\frac{\partial \tilde U}{\partial u} + \left(\eta^{k\ell} - u^2\gamma^{k\ell} - u^k u^\ell\right)\frac{\partial \tilde U}{\partial u^k} = 0, \tag{24}$$

which are necessary for constraints $\mathcal{R} = 0$, $\mathcal{R}_i$ to be first class (see Appendix A).

3 dRGT-like potential in bigravity

To simplify formulas of this article we introduce some new notations:

$$\tilde U'' = \frac{\partial^2 \tilde U}{\partial u^2} \quad \tilde U_i = \frac{\partial^2 \tilde U}{\partial u \partial u^i} \quad L_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2 \tilde U}{\partial u^i \partial u^j}, \quad \bar U^i = (L^{-1})^{ij}\tilde U_j, \tag{25}$$

$$\mathcal{S} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{R}}{\partial u} = \bar{\mathcal{H}} + \frac{\partial \tilde U}{\partial u}, \qquad \mathcal{S}_i = \frac{\partial \mathcal{R}}{\partial u^i} = \bar{\mathcal{H}}_i + \frac{\partial \tilde U}{\partial u^i}, \tag{26}$$

$$K_{ij}(x, y) = \{\mathcal{S}_i(x), \mathcal{S}_j(y)\}, \qquad \bar K = L^{-1} K L^{-1}. \tag{27}$$

It is claimed [9] that secondary constraints $\mathcal{S}$, $\mathcal{S}_i$ cannot be solved for lapse and shift in massive gravity or in bigravity with dRGT potential. In our approach instead of lapse and shift $\bar N$, $\bar N^i$ we use variables u, u^i, so this claim now sounds as

$$\frac{D(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}_i)}{D(u, u^k)} = 0. \tag{28}$$

It is evident from constraints structure (26) that this Jacobian is really a Hessian

$$\frac{D(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}_i)}{D(u, u^k)} = \mathrm{Det}\left(\frac{\partial^2 \tilde U}{\partial u^a \partial u^b}\right) = \mathrm{Det}\mathbf{L} = 0, \tag{29}$$

where we give a notation introduced in [18] (I.94). With the new notations (25) it is possible to write matrix $\mathbf{L}$ as follows

$$\mathbf{L} = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde U'' & \tilde U_j \\ \tilde U_i & L_{ij}(x) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{30}$$

Then the degeneracy of this matrix means that for potential of dRGT-like form, which we call in this article as a potential of special form, the following condition should be valid

$$\tilde{U}_i \left(L^{-1}\right)^{ij} \tilde{U}_j = \tilde{U}'', \tag{31}$$

or

$$\tilde{U}_i \bar{U}^i = \tilde{U}''. \tag{32}$$

The straightforward check of degeneracy of $\mathbf{L}$ and of nondegeneracy of $||L_{ij}||$ for the dRGT potential is problematic. Our method is to suppose that they are valid and to consider their consequences. Let us remind that there are two other presumptions adopted in this article: 1) that dRGT potential can be written as a function of $3+1$-decomposition components of two metric tensors and 2) that this potential fulfills conditions (23), (24), which are necessary for existence of the first class constraint algebra of hypersurface deformations.

Introduced in our first article [18] matrix $\mathbf{L}$ of Poisson brackets between 8 constraints of the set χ_A given (32) becomes degenerate and as a result cannot be used for a construction of Dirac brackets [19]. Two constraints from this set will not be included into the first set of second class constraints which will be denoted now as $\tilde{\chi}_A$, $A = 1, .., 6$: $\tilde{\chi}_A$, $A = 1, .., 6$

$$\tilde{\chi}_A = \left(\pi_{u^i}, \mathcal{S}_i\right), \tag{33}$$

Then the matrix of Poisson brackets for constraints $\tilde{\chi}_A$ will be

$$||\{\tilde{\chi}_A(x), \tilde{\chi}_B(y)\}|| = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & -\tilde{\mathbf{L}}(x)\delta(x,y) \\ \tilde{\mathbf{L}}(x)\delta(x,y) & \tilde{\mathbf{K}}(x,y) \end{pmatrix}, \tag{34}$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathbf{L}}(x) = ||L_{ij}(x)||, \tag{35}$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{K}}(x,y) = ||K_{ij}(x,y)||. \tag{36}$$

As we suppose that matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{L}}$ is invertible than matrix $||\{\tilde{\chi}_A, \tilde{\chi}_B\}||$ is invertible too, and its inverse has a following form

$$\tilde{\mathbf{C}}(x,y) = \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{\mathbf{L}}^{-1}(x)\tilde{\mathbf{K}}(x,y)\tilde{\mathbf{L}}^{-1}(y) & \tilde{\mathbf{L}}^{-1}(x)\delta(x,y) \\ -\tilde{\mathbf{L}}^{-1}(x)\delta(x,y) & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{37}$$

Dirac brackets are now defined as follows

$$\{F,G\}_{\tilde{D}} = \{F,G\} - \int dx \int dy \{F, \tilde{\chi}_A(x)\} \tilde{\mathbf{C}}^{AB}(x,y) \{\tilde{\chi}_B(y), G\}, \tag{38}$$

or, in more detail form,

$$\begin{aligned} \{F,G\}_{\tilde{D}} &= \{F,G\} - \int dx \int dy \{F, \pi_{u^i}(x)\} \bar{K}^{ij}(x,y) \{\pi_{u^j}(y), G\} - \\ &- \int dx \{F, \pi_{u^i}(x)\} (L^{-1})^{ij}(x) \{\mathcal{S}_j(x), G\} + \\ &+ \int dx \{F, \mathcal{S}_i(x)\} (L^{-1})^{ij}(x) \{\pi_{u^j}(x), G\}. \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

In case both functionals F, G do not depend on u^i, these brackets coincide with Poisson ones. As second class constraints

$$\mathcal{S}_i = 0 \tag{40}$$

can be explicitly solved for u^i, and we can work with these variables as with functions of variables u, η_{ij}, γ_{ij} and of $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_i$, see Appendix B. Functions N, N^i are Lagrangian multipliers for constraints $\mathcal{R} = 0$, $\mathcal{R}_i = 0$ and have zero Dirac brackets with all functionals. Primary constraint $\pi_u = 0$ is to be included into the Hamiltonian with a corresponding Lagrangian multiplier

$$\mathrm{H} = \int d^3x \left(N\mathcal{R} + N^i \mathcal{R}_i + \lambda \pi_u \right), \tag{41}$$

whereas secondary constraint $\mathcal{S} = 0$ reappears from the requirement of the primary constraint conservation:

$$\dot{\pi}_u = \{\pi_u, \mathrm{H}\}_{\tilde{D}} = -\mathcal{S} = 0. \tag{42}$$

Here we stand with 13 pairs of canonically conjugate gravitational variables (u, π_u), (η_{ij}, Π^{ij}), (γ_{ij}, π^{ij}), and with some pairs of matter variables, (ψ_A, Π^A), (ϕ_A, π^A), of course. There is a set of constraints which are weakly zero (i.e. they could not be treated as zero before calculation of Dirac brackets):

$$\pi_u \approx 0, \quad \mathcal{S} \approx 0, \quad \mathcal{R} \approx 0, \quad \mathcal{R}_i \approx 0. \tag{43}$$

Next step is to clear whether this set of constraints is full and to separate them into first and second class sets. To solve this problem we should calculate Dirac brackets between the constraints.

$\{,\}_{\tilde{D}}$	$u(y)$	$\pi_u(y)$	$u^k(y)$	$\eta_{mn}(y)$	$\Pi^{mn}(y)$	$\gamma_{mn}(y)$	$\pi^{mn}(y)$
$u(x)$	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
$\pi_u(x)$	-1	0	$\bar{U}^i$	0	0	0	0
$u^i(x)$	0	$-\bar{U}^i$	$\bar{K}^{ik}$	0	A^{imn}	B^i_{mn}	C^{imn}
$\eta_{ij}(x)$	0	0	0	0	δ^{mn}_{ij}	0	0
$\Pi^{ij}(x)$	0	0	$-A^{kij}$	$-\delta^{ij}_{mn}$	0	0	0
$\gamma_{ij}(x)$	0	0	$-B^k_{ij}$	0	0	0	δ^{mn}_{ij}
$\pi^{ij}(x)$	0	0	$-C^{kij}$	0	0	$-\delta^{ij}_{mn}$	0

Figure 1: Table of Dirac brackets for main variables

In more detail some Dirac brackets are given below:

$$\begin{aligned} A^{imn} &= -(L^{-1})^{ij}\frac{\partial^2\tilde{U}}{\partial u^j\partial\eta_{mn}}\delta(x,y), &(44)\\ B^i_{mn} &= -(L^{-1})^{ij}(x)\{\bar{\mathcal{H}}_j(x),\gamma_{mn}(y)\}, &(45)\\ C^{imn} &= -(L^{-1})^{ij}\left(\frac{\partial^2\tilde{U}}{\partial u^j\partial\gamma_{mn}}+\{\bar{\mathcal{H}}_j(x),\pi^{mn}(y)\}\right). &(46)\end{aligned}$$

4 Dirac brackets for secondary constraints

In Appendix A we display Poisson brackets between constraints $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{R}_i$. Replacing these Poisson brackets with Dirac ones we can treat constraints

$$\pi_{u^i}=0, \qquad \mathcal{S}_i=0, \tag{47}$$

as strongly equal to zero, i.e. we can omit them and obtain the following

$$\{\mathcal{R}(x),\mathcal{R}(y)\}_{\tilde{D}}=\left[(\eta^{ik}\mathcal{R}_k+uu^i\mathcal{S})(x)+(\eta^{ik}\mathcal{R}_k+uu^i\mathcal{S})(y)\right]\delta_{,i}(x,y), \tag{48}$$

$$\{\mathcal{R}_i(x),\mathcal{R}_k(y)\}_{\tilde{D}}=\mathcal{R}_i(y)\delta_{,k}(x,y)+\mathcal{R}_k(x)\delta_{,i}(x,y), \tag{49}$$

$$\{\mathcal{R}_i(x),\mathcal{R}(y)\}_{\tilde{D}}=\mathcal{R}(x)\delta_{,i}(x,y)+u_{,i}\mathcal{S}\delta(x,y). \tag{50}$$

Dirac bracket of constraint $\mathcal{S}$ with itself is, for the general potential, not zero:

$$\begin{aligned}
\{\mathcal{S}(x), \mathcal{S}(y)\}_{\tilde{D}} &= \{\mathcal{S}(x), \mathcal{S}(y)\} + \bar{U}^i(x)\{\mathcal{S}_i(x), \mathcal{S}_j(y)\}\bar{U}^j(y) - \\
&- \{\mathcal{S}(x), \mathcal{S}_i(y)\}\bar{U}^i(y) + \{\mathcal{S}(y), \mathcal{S}_i(x)\}\bar{U}^i(x) = \\
&= (\Theta^i - \bar{U}^i\mathcal{S})(x)\delta_{,i}(x,y) - (\Theta^i - \bar{U}^i\mathcal{S})(y)\delta_{,i}(y,x), \qquad (51)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Theta^i = \left(\bar{U}^k \hat{D}\left(\delta^i_k - 2\gamma_{jk}\frac{\partial}{\partial\gamma_{ij}}\right) - \gamma^{ij}\frac{\partial}{\partial u^j}\right)\tilde{U}, \qquad (52)$$

and a new notation has been introduced

$$\hat{D} = \frac{\partial}{\partial u} - \bar{U}^i\frac{\partial}{\partial u^i}. \qquad (53)$$

Evidently, if the following condition is valid for some quantity Z,

$$\hat{D}Z = 0, \qquad (54)$$

then this quantity Z does not depend on u when constraints $\mathcal{S}_i = 0$ are satisfied.

Dirac bracket for constraints $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{R}$ is, in general, not weakly equal to zero:

$$\{\mathcal{R}(x), \mathcal{S}(y)\}_{\tilde{D}} = \left(u^i - u\bar{U}^i\right)\mathcal{S}(x)\delta_{,i}(x,y) - \left(u(\bar{U}^i\mathcal{S})_{,i} + \Omega\right)\delta(x,y),$$

and so, provides us with a new (tertiary) constraint $\Omega = 0$ which is called secondary in Refs. [9, 13]

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega &= \left(u\hat{D} - 1\right)[\tilde{U}, \bar{\mathcal{H}}] + \hat{D}[\tilde{U}, \mathcal{H}] + \\
&+ \left((\bar{U}_{k|l} + \bar{U}_{l|k}) + (u_{k|l} + u_{l|k})\hat{D}\right)\frac{\partial\tilde{U}}{\partial\gamma_{kl}} + \\
&+ u_{,i}\bar{U}^i\frac{\partial\tilde{U}}{\partial u} - \left(u^k\bar{U}^i_{|k} - \bar{U}^k u^i_{|k} + \gamma^{ik}u_{,k}\right)\frac{\partial\tilde{U}}{\partial u^i} - \\
&- \left(u^i\hat{D}\tilde{U} + u\gamma^{ik}\frac{\partial\tilde{U}}{\partial u^k} + 2\bar{U}^j\gamma_{jk}\frac{\partial\tilde{U}}{\partial\gamma_{ik}}\right)_{,i}, \qquad (55)
\end{aligned}$$

here square brackets denote coefficients standing before δ-function in the related ultralocal Poisson bracket:

$$\{\tilde{U}(x), \bar{\mathcal{H}}(y)\} = [\tilde{U}, \bar{\mathcal{H}}](x)\delta(x,y), \qquad \{\tilde{U}(x), \mathcal{H}(y)\} = [\tilde{U}, \mathcal{H}](x)\delta(x,y),$$

and indices of quantities u^i, $\bar{U}^i$ are moved down by means of metric γ_{ij}. First class constraints $\mathcal{R}_i$ as usual generate spatial diffeomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathcal{S}(x), \mathcal{R}_i(y)\}_{\tilde{D}} &= -\mathcal{S}(y)\delta_{,i}(y,x), \\ \{\Omega(x), \mathcal{R}_i(y)\}_{\tilde{D}} &= -\Omega(y)\delta_{,i}(y,x) \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

It is possible also to calculate the following brackets

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathcal{R}(x), \pi_u(y)\}_{\tilde{D}} &= \mathcal{S}(x)\delta(x,y), \\ \{\Omega(x), \pi_u(y)\}_{\tilde{D}} &= \Theta^i(x)\delta_{,i}(x,y) - \Theta^i(y)\delta_{,i}(y,x). \end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

In Ref. [13] it was proved that $\mathcal{S}$ commutes with itself for the dRGT potential. So, it is reasonable to hope that our potential should satisfy condition $\Theta^i = 0$, i.e.

$$\left(\bar{U}^k \hat{D}\left(\delta^i_k - 2\gamma_{jk}\frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma_{ij}}\right) - \gamma^{ij}\frac{\partial}{\partial u^j}\right)\tilde{U} = 0 \tag{58}$$

The two requirements might be fulfilled at once by this:

1. the tertiary (often called secondary) constraint will appear;
2. this appearing constraint will not depend on variable u.

Eq. (58) will be proved in the next Section. It is evident that if Θ^i were nonzero, then $\Omega = 0$ would be an equation fixing variable u and there would be 3 second class and 4 first class constraints for 13 pairs of gravitational canonical variables in bigravity. This would give $7+1/2$ gravitational degrees of freedom for the bigravity, and $5 + 1/2$ for the massive gravity in line with the conclusion first made by Kluson [12].

5 Transformation of variables

Previous sections were written before we discovered Comelli et al articles [22, 24]. Their analysis refers to the case of the massive gravity, the bigravity is not considered. Here we try to apply their ideas to the bigravity case. The main point is to use the results on Monge-Ampère equation obtained by mathematicians [25]. First, we can see that $(1, -\bar{U}^i)$ is a null-vector of the Hessian matrix

$$\mathbf{L} = \left\|\frac{\partial^2 \tilde{U}}{\partial u^a \partial u^b}\right\|,$$

so, in order to be close to article [25], we introduce a new notation:

$$\xi^i = -\bar{U}^i.$$

It is suitable to replace potential $\tilde{U}$ by function $V(\xi^i, \eta_{ij}, \gamma_{ij})$, such that

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{U}}{\partial u^i} = \frac{\partial V}{\partial \xi^i}, \qquad \frac{\partial \tilde{U}}{\partial u} = V - \xi^i \frac{\partial V}{\partial \xi^i}, \tag{59}$$

then it follows that

$$\hat{D}\tilde{U} = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial u} - \bar{U}^k \frac{\partial}{\partial u^k}\right)\tilde{U} = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial u} + \xi^k \frac{\partial}{\partial u^k}\right)\tilde{U} = V. \tag{60}$$

Integrability condition for Monge-Ampère equation

$$\mathrm{Det}\left\|\frac{\partial^2 \tilde{U}}{\partial u^a \partial u^b}\right\| = 0 \tag{61}$$

is as follows (see [25] for details)

$$\hat{D}\xi^i = \frac{\partial \xi^i}{\partial u} + \xi^k \frac{\partial \xi^i}{\partial u^k} = 0. \tag{62}$$

At last, it is proved in Ref. [25] that any implicit solution for system of equations (61) can be written as follows [25]

$$u^i - u\xi^i = (V^{-1})^{ik} \frac{\partial W}{\partial \xi^k}, \tag{63}$$

where $W = W(\xi^i, \eta_{ij}, \gamma_{ij})$ is an arbitrary function, and

$$V_{ik} = \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial \xi^i \partial \xi^k}.$$

If we apply differential operator $\hat{D}$ to Eq. (24), and take into account (59) and (60) we get the following

$$2\xi^j \gamma_{jk} \frac{\partial \tilde{U}}{\partial \gamma_{k\ell}} + 2u^j \gamma_{jk} \hat{D} \frac{\partial \tilde{U}}{\partial \gamma_{k\ell}} - (\xi^\ell u + u^\ell)\left(V - \xi^i \frac{\partial V}{\partial \xi^i}\right) - \left(2u\gamma^{k\ell} + \xi^k u^\ell + u^k \xi^\ell\right)\frac{\partial V}{\partial \xi^k} = 0, \tag{64}$$

then after repeating this operation and dividing the result by factor 2 we obtain

$$2\xi^j\gamma_{jk}\hat{D}\frac{\partial\tilde{U}}{\partial\gamma_{k\ell}}+u^j\gamma_{jk}(\hat{D})^2\frac{\partial\tilde{U}}{\partial\gamma_{k\ell}}-\xi^\ell V-\gamma^{k\ell}\frac{\partial V}{\partial\xi^k}=0. \tag{65}$$

Now

$$\hat{D}\frac{\partial\tilde{U}}{\partial\gamma_{k\ell}}=\frac{\partial V}{\partial\gamma_{k\ell}}-\frac{\partial\xi^m}{\partial\gamma_{k\ell}}\frac{\partial V}{\partial\xi^m}, \tag{66}$$

as this expression depends on u, u^i only through variable ξ^i and given Eq. (62), it is annihilated by operator $\hat{D}$, so Eq. (58) is proved.

Here it is interesting to compare our results with the argumentation given in the pioneering work [10]. Variables u^i here play the role analogous to N^i there, u is similar to N, and variables ξ^i or $\bar{U}^i$ are analogous to n^i. Two of the three criteria for the existence of the Hamiltonian constraint formulated in Ref. [10] are fulfilled here as one can see from Eqs. (59) and (63). It is proved in Ref. [10] that their third criterion is fulfilled automatically when the other two are satisfied. And let us consider a function

$$\frac{\partial\tilde{U}}{\partial u}=V-\xi^i\frac{\partial V}{\partial\xi^i}$$

on the surface of constraints $\mathcal{S}_i$, then

$$\mathcal{V}=\left.\frac{\partial\tilde{U}}{\partial u}\right|_{\mathcal{S}_i=0}=V-\xi^i\bar{\mathcal{H}}_i, \qquad \frac{\partial\mathcal{V}}{\partial\xi^i}\approx 0,$$

therefore on this constraint surface we have

$$\frac{\partial\mathcal{S}}{\partial\xi^i}\approx 0,$$

as it has been stated in Ref. [10].

6 Dirac brackets for tertiary and quaternary constraints

For the potential satisfying $\Theta^i=0$ we are to continue the process of calculating Dirac brackets between constraints in looking for new constraints. Unfortunately, expressions for constraints evidently become more complicated with each step. We derived tertiary constraint Ω above, see Eq. (55).

$\{,\}_{\tilde{D}}$	$\pi_u(y)$	$\Psi(y)$	$\Omega(y)$	$\mathcal{S}(y)$	$\mathcal{R}(y)$	$\mathcal{R}_j(y)$
$\pi_u(x)$	0	$\neq 0$	$-\hat{\Theta} = 0$	0	≈ 0	0
$\Psi(x)$	$\neq 0$					
$\Omega(x)$	$\hat{\Theta} = 0$			$\neq 0$	$\Psi \approx 0$	≈ 0
$\mathcal{S}(x)$	0		$\neq 0$	$\hat{\Theta} = 0$	≈ 0	≈ 0
$\mathcal{R}(x)$	≈ 0		$-\Psi \approx 0$	≈ 0	≈ 0	≈ 0
$\mathcal{R}_i(x)$	0		≈ 0	≈ 0	≈ 0	≈ 0

Figure 2: Table of Dirac brackets for constraints

In order to preserve this constraint in the process of evolution we are to ensure the following condition

$$\dot{\Omega} = \{\Omega, \mathrm{H}\}_{\tilde{D}} = \int N\{\Omega, \mathcal{R}\}_{\tilde{D}} + N^i\{\Omega, \mathcal{R}_i\}_{\tilde{D}} + \lambda\{\Omega, \pi_u\}_{\tilde{D}} \approx 0. \tag{67}$$

As the second and the third Dirac brackets here are zero on the surface of already known constraints, due to Eqs. (56), (57) it is necessary to calculate only the first bracket:

$$\{\Omega(x), \mathcal{R}(y)\}_{\tilde{D}} = \Psi(x)\delta(x, y), \tag{68}$$

that will give us new (quaternary) constraint

$$\Psi \approx 0. \tag{69}$$

The Jacobi identity

$$\{\Omega, \{\pi_u, \mathcal{R}\}_{\tilde{D}}\}_{\tilde{D}} + \{\mathcal{R}, \{\Omega, \pi_u\}_{\tilde{D}}\}_{\tilde{D}} + \{\pi_u, \{\mathcal{R}, \Omega\}_{\tilde{D}}\}_{\tilde{D}} = 0,$$

if we take into account Eqs. (57), gives us the following result

$$\{\pi_u(y), \Psi(x)\}_{\tilde{D}}\delta(x, z) = -\{\Omega(x), \mathcal{S}(z)\}_{\tilde{D}}\delta(z, y), \tag{70}$$

and so it is evident that if $\{\Omega, \mathcal{S}\}_{\tilde{D}}$ is nonzero, then $\{\pi_u, \Psi\}_{\tilde{D}}$ is nonzero also. But it is easy to check that there are nonzero terms in $\{\Omega, \mathcal{S}\}_{\tilde{D}}$, for example,

$$[[V, \mathcal{H}], \bar{\mathcal{H}}] = \frac{4\kappa^{(f)}\kappa^{(g)}}{\sqrt{\eta\gamma}} \left(\Pi_{ij} - \eta_{ij}\frac{\Pi}{2}\right) \frac{\partial^2 V}{\partial\eta_{ij}\partial\gamma_{mn}} \left(\pi_{mn} - \gamma_{mn}\frac{\pi}{2}\right), \tag{71}$$

that cannot be cancelled by other terms and do not appear in other constraints. Therefore both Dirac brackets in Eq.(70) are nonzero. Of course, in looking for the so-called partially massless case, see Refs. [26, 27, 28, 29, 30], one needs a more detailed study.

There is a potential problem if $\Psi(x)$ occurs not a function, but a differential operator, even after taking into account all constraints. Then Eq. (67) can be solved for u, though the solution will depend on N.

We combine schematically all the results of our calculations of the Dirac brackets in Table 2, these results are displayed above in this text in more detail. One can see that there are 3 blocks standing on the diagonal: two nondegenerate 2×2 matices for two pairs of the second class constraints (π_u, Ψ) and $(\Omega, \mathcal{S})$ and one degenerate 4×4 matrix for the first class constraints $(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}_i)$. Therefore, for 13 pairs of the gravitational variables we have 4 first class constraints and 4 second class constraints, then this corresponds to 7 degrees of freedom for the bigravity.

7 Hamiltonian approach to massive gravity

Let us consider now the case when the first metric is a fixed GR solution (maybe, with a cosmological constant) and only the second one is dynamical. We call such theories as the massive gravity or the bimetrical gravity following N. Rosen [1]. Recently they have got a revival [31, 32, 33, 34]. Given metric $f_{\mu\nu}$ and embedding variables $e^\alpha(t, x^k)$ we are to treat $N(t, x^k)$, $N^i(t, x^k)$, $\eta_{ij}(t, x^k)$ as the known functions. For the Hamiltonian we can use the following expression

$$\mathrm{H} = \int d^3x \left(N \left(u\bar{\mathcal{H}} + u^i \bar{\mathcal{H}}_i + \tilde{U} \right) + N^i \bar{\mathcal{H}}_i + \lambda \pi_u + \lambda^i \pi_{u^i} \right). \qquad (72)$$

It is similar to bigravity Hamiltonian given that $\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_i$ are now zero, as metric $f_{\mu\nu}$ is now a fixed solution of GR equations. Of course, the Poisson brackets now do not involve variational derivatives over η_{ij}. There are 4 primary constraints

$$\pi_u = 0, \quad \pi_{u^i} = 0. \qquad (73)$$

and, in their turn, they generate 4 secondary constraints

$$\bar{\mathcal{H}} + \frac{\partial \tilde{U}}{\partial u} \equiv \mathcal{S} = 0, \qquad \bar{\mathcal{H}}_i + \frac{\partial \tilde{U}}{\partial u^i} \equiv \mathcal{S}_i = 0, \qquad (74)$$

where $\tilde{U} = \tilde{U}(u, u^i, \gamma_{ij}, \eta_{ij})$. The Poisson brackets matrix of these constraints should be degenerate for dRGT potential as in the bigravity case. Then we again construct the Dirac brackets (of course, they are a bit more compact than in the bigravity, as the Poisson brackets now do not involve variational derivatives over $\frac{\delta}{\delta\eta_{ij}}$) by inverting 6×6 matrix constructed of the second class constraints $\tilde{\chi}_A = 0$. As the Hamiltonian is a first class quantity we can drop out the second class constraints to simplify its form

$$\mathrm{H}_{\text{reduced}} = \int d^3x \left(N\left(u\bar{\mathcal{H}} + \tilde{U}\right) - \bar{N}^i \frac{\partial\tilde{U}}{\partial u^i} + \lambda\pi_u \right). \tag{75}$$

Primary constraint π_u is still present in the reduced Hamiltonian accompanied by its Lagrangian multiplier λ, and secondary constraint $\mathcal{S}$ reappears as a condition of preservation of π_u in evolution

$$\dot{\pi}_u = \{\pi_u, \mathrm{H}_{\text{reduced}}\}_{\tilde{D}} = -N\mathcal{S} = 0. \tag{76}$$

Constraint $\mathcal{S}$ can be solved for the ghost variable. For consistency of the evolution we should calculate the Dirac bracket of the secondary constraint with the Hamiltonian. Applying Eq. (38) we can write this Dirac bracket through the Poisson ones

$$\begin{aligned}\{\mathcal{S}(x), \mathrm{H}_{\text{reduced}}\}_{\tilde{D}} &= \{\mathcal{S}(x), \mathrm{H}_{\text{reduced}}\} - \bar{U}^i(x)\{\mathcal{S}_i(x), \mathrm{H}_{\text{reduced}}\} - \\ &- \int d^3y \left(\bar{U}^i(x)\{\mathcal{S}_i(x), \mathcal{S}_j(y)\} + \{\mathcal{S}(x), \mathcal{S}_j(y)\}\right)\bar{N}^j(y).\end{aligned}$$

The result is a new expression

$$\{\mathcal{S}(x), \mathrm{H}_{\text{reduced}}\}_{\tilde{D}} = \tilde{\Omega}, \tag{77}$$

which is necessary to be zero

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\Omega} &= N\left(u\hat{D} - 1\right)[\tilde{U}, \bar{\mathcal{H}}] + \\ &+ \left(N(\bar{U}_{k|l} + \bar{U}_{l|k}) + (\bar{N}_{k|l} + \bar{N}_{l|k})\hat{D}\right)\frac{\partial\tilde{U}}{\partial\gamma_{kl}} + \\ &+ (Nu)_{,i}\bar{U}^i\frac{\partial\tilde{U}}{\partial u} - \left(\bar{N}^k\bar{U}^i_{|k} - \bar{U}^k\bar{N}^i_{|k} + \gamma^{ik}(Nu)_{,k}\right)\frac{\partial\tilde{U}}{\partial u^i} - \\ &- \left(\bar{N}^i\hat{D}\tilde{U} + Nu\gamma^{ik}\frac{\partial\tilde{U}}{\partial u^k} + 2N\bar{U}^j\gamma_{jk}\frac{\partial\tilde{U}}{\partial\gamma_{ik}}\right)_{,i} = 0.\end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

Therefore, we have got a new constraint. Given zero Dirac bracket $\{\tilde{\Omega}, \pi_u\}_{\tilde{D}}$, this constraint does not depend on variable u when $\mathcal{S}_i$ constraints are taken into account. Eq. (78) is linear in momenta π^{ij} and so can be solved for the momentum variable which is conjugate to the ghost variable.

Next step is to derive the Hamiltonian equation for constraint $\tilde{\Omega}$

$$\dot{\tilde{\Omega}} = \{\tilde{\Omega}, \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{reduced}}\}_{\tilde{D}} = \tilde{\Psi},$$

and to require that $\dot{\tilde{\Omega}}$ should be zero. So we get the last constraint $\tilde{\Psi}$, which serves for fixing variable u. At the end, we have 4 second class constraints $\mathcal{S}$, $\tilde{\Omega}$, π_u, $\tilde{\Psi}$ for 7 pairs of gravitational canonical variables. Two second class constraints $\tilde{\Psi}$ and π_u serve to kill a pair of canonical variables (u, π_u). Two other second class constraints serve to kill the ghost degree of freedom. Therefore this gives 5 degrees of freedom for massive gravity.

8 Conclusion

We have studied here the canonical structure of a model which, as we hope, should be isomorphic to widely discussed dRGT theory [6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14] of massive gravity and bigravity. In this work the potential should satisfy 4 conditions:

1. the potential can be expressed as a function of 3+1-decomposed metric variables $\tilde{U}(u, u^i, \eta_{ij}, \gamma_{ij})$;
2. the potential allows 4 first class constraints $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}_i$ in bigravity case;
3. the Hessian of the potential in the lapse-like and shift-like variables u, u^i is degenerate[2];
4. the Hessian in the shift-like variables u^i is non-degenerate.

We conclude that under these suppositions we get a theory with 5 gravitational degrees of freedom in the massive gravity case and with 7 degrees of freedom in the bigravity case. It would be interesting to prove whether the dRGT-potential is a unique realization of the above axioms.

---

[2] Our variables can be expressed through lapses and shifts of the two metrics as follows $u = \bar{N}/N$, $u^i = (N^i - \bar{N}^i)/N$, see Eq.(15).

Since the first part of this work [18] has appeared, some interesting and related articles have been published. Kluson's preprint [20], in fact, was simultaneous to [18] , and the same algebra of first class constraints in bigravity was proved under some conditions imposed on the potential, the dRGT case was not included. Distinctions from our work are in more narrow class of potentials, in the choice of variables, and in using ADM approach, not Kuchař's one. Alexandrov et al [15] developed Ashtekar-like approach and variables. These authors were careful to mention some difficulties with the reality conditions. Their main conclusion is a confirmation of statements made in articles [9], at least for one variant of the dRGT potential. Many interesting ideas are suggested, including a choice of an arithmetic average of triads related to different metrics. In article by Deser and Waldron [5] a simple derivation of Hamiltonian constraint is demonstrated, the interesting reference to considerably earlier work is given, and a statement on superluminal effects in massive gravity is made. Certainly, to make final conclusions on the consistency of any theory with two or more spacetime metrics it is necessary to provide a deep analysis of causality problem, but we here do not plan to discuss it. Two other articles by Kluson [35, 36] have appeared later and contain some pessimistic conclusions related to the bigravity. In contrast to our results it is claimed that constraint playing the role $\mathcal{R}$ becomes second class and so the theory loses the diagonal diffeomorphism invariance. As we have shown here, $\mathcal{R}$ stays the first class constraint, as it is in GR. Let us mention that calculations are rather long in this theory, and so a choice of variables matters. The choice made in Ref. [35] is in line with democracy stereotype whereas we give a preference to one metric over the other (the revolution is allowed, see (I.59)), this maybe the reason for the discrepancy. The appearance of e-print by Comelli at all [22] was important for us. The similar plan to study the massive gravity with the potential of a general form was proposed there (the bigravity case was not discussed). Reading Ref. [22] moved us to revise the conclusions made in the first version of this work [21]. Unfortunately in preparing [21] we were not informed on the preceding publication by that group [24].

Acknowledgements We are pleased to thank S. Deser, S.F. Hassan, M.V. Neshchadim, A. Waldron and Yu.M. Zinoviev for comments and discussions. One of the authors (V.O.S.) is grateful to the organizers and participants of Workshop on Infrared Modifications of Gravity (ICTP, Trieste, 26 - 30 September, 2011) for stimulating atmosphere and to Prof. S. Randjbar-Daemi for hospitality during his visit to ICTP.

References

[1] N. Rosen, *Phys. Rev.* **57** 147-150; 150-153 (1940); Flat-space metric in general relativity theory. *Ann. of Phys.* **22**, 1-11 (1963); *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **4**, 435-447 (1973).

[2] C. J. Isham, A. Salam and J. Strathdee, *Phys. Lett. B* **31** 300-302 (1970); *Phys. Rev.* **D3** 867-873 (1971).

[3] T. Damour and I.I. Kogan, *Phys.Rev.* **D 66** 104024 (2002).

[4] D.G. Boulware and S. Deser, *Phys.Rev.* **D6** 3368-3382 (1972).

[5] S. Deser, A. Waldron. Acausality of massive gravity; arXiv:1212.5835.

[6] C. de Rham, G. Gabadadze, A. J. Tolley, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106** 231101 (2011); arXiv:1011.1232; *Phys. Lett. B* **711** 190195 (2012); arXiv:1107.3820

[7] B. Zumino, "Effective Lagrangians and broken symmetries," in Brandeis Univ. Lectures on Elementary Particles and Quantum Field Theory (MIT Press Cambridge, Mass.), Vol. 2, 1970, 437.

[8] G. D'Amico, C. de Rham, S. Dubovsky, G. Gabadadze, D. Pirtskhalava, A.J. Tolley. *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 124046 (2011); arXiv:1108.5231.

[9] S. F. Hassan, Rachel A. Rosen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108** 041101 (2012), arXiv:1106.3344.

[10] S. F. Hassan, Rachel A. Rosen, Angnis Schmidt-May, *JHEP* **1202** 026 (2012), arXiv:1109.3230.

[11] S. F. Hassan, Rachel A. Rosen, *JHEP* **1202** 126 (2012), arXiv:1109.3515.

[12] J. Kluson, *JHEP* **1201** (2012) 13; arXiv:1109.3052.

[13] S. F. Hassan, Rachel A. Rosen, *JHEP* **1204** 123 (2012), arXiv:1111.2070.

[14] A. Golovnev, *Phys. Lett. B* **707** 404-408 (2012); arXiv:1112.2134.

[15] S. Alexandrov, K. Krasnov, and S. Speziale. Chiral description of ghost-free massive gravity; arXiv:1212.3614.

[16] K. Kuchař, *J. Math. Phys.* **17** 777-791; 792-800; 801-820 (1977); **18** 1589-1597 (1978).

[17] R. Arnowitt, S. Deser and Ch.W. Misner, in Gravitation, an Introduction to Current Research, ed. L. Witten, Wiley, New York (1963); arXiv:gr-qc/0405109.

[18] V.O. Soloviev, M.V. Tchichikina. Bigravity in Kuchař's Hamiltonian formalism. 1. The general case; arXiv:1211.6530 (to be published).

[19] P.A.M. Dirac, Lectures on Quantum Mechanics. Yeshiva University, New York, (1964).

[20] J. Kluson. Hamiltonian formalism of particular bimetric gravity model; arXiv:1211.6267.

[21] V.O. Soloviev, M.V. Tchichikina. Bigravity in Kuchar's Hamiltonian formalism. 2. The special case; arXiv:1302.5096v1.

[22] D. Comelli, F. Nesti and L. Pilo. Weak Massive Gravity; arXiv:1302.4447.

[23] V.O. Solov'ev, *Particles & Nuclei.* **19** 482-497 (1988).

[24] D. Comelli, M. Crisostomi, F. Nesti and L. Pilo. *Phys. Rev. D* **86** 101502(R) (2012); arXiv:1204.1027.

[25] D. Fairlie, A. Leznov. *J. Geom. Phys.* **16** 385-390 (1995); arxiv:hep-th/9403134.

[26] S. Deser, M. Sandora, A. Waldron. Nonlinear Partially Massless from Massive Gravity? arXiv:1301.5621.

[27] Claudia de Rham, Kurt Hinterbichler, Rachel A. Rosen, Andrew J. Tolley. Evidence for and Obstructions to Non-Linear Partially Massless Gravity; arXiv:1302.0025.

[28] S. F. Hassan, Angnis Schmidt-May, Mikael von Strauss. On Partially Massless Bimetric Gravity; arXiv:1208.1797.

[29] S. F. Hassan, Angnis Schmidt-May, Mikael von Strauss. Bimetric Theory and Partial Masslessness with Lanczos-Lovelock Terms in Arbitrary Dimensions; arXiv:1212.4525.

[30] S. F. Hassan, Angnis Schmidt-May, Mikael von Strauss. Higher Derivative Gravity and Conformal Gravity From Bimetric and Partially Massless Bimetric Theory arXiv:1303.6940

[31] V.A. Rubakov and P.G. Tinyakov, *Phys.-Uspekhi* **51** 759-822 (2008); arXiv:0802.4379.

[32] D. Blas. Aspects of Infrared Modifications of Gravity; arXiv:0809.3744.

[33] A. Mironov, S. Mironov, A. Morozov and A. Morozov. Resolving puzzles of massive gravity with and without violation of Lorentz symmetry; arXiv:0910.5243v1. Linearized Lorentz-violating gravity and discriminant locus in the moduli space of mass terms; arXiv:0910.5245v1.

[34] Kurt Hinterbichler, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **84** 671710 (2012); arXiv:1105.3735.

[35] J. Kluson. Is bimetric gravity really ghost free? arXiv:1301.3296.

[36] J. Kluson. Hamiltonian Formalism of General Bimetric Gravity; arXiv:1303.1652.

[37] V.O. Soloviev, M.V. Tchichikina. Ultralocal energy density in massive gravity; arXiv:1106.5709.

A Calculating Poisson brackets of $\mathcal{R}$, $\mathcal{R}_i$

In calculating Poisson brackets between constraints $\mathcal{R}$, $\mathcal{R}_i$ we can treat u, u^i as functions, and not as canonical variables, because their conjugate momenta do not appear in these relations. Then potential $\tilde{U}$ has nonzero Poisson brackets only with gravitational momenta Π^{ij}, π^{ij}, this results in appearance of derivatives $\partial\tilde{U}/\partial\eta_{ij}$ and $\partial\tilde{U}/\partial\gamma_{ij}$. In derivation of the first bracket

$$\{\mathcal{R}_i(x), \mathcal{R}_j(y)\} = \mathcal{R}_i(y)\delta_{,j}(x,y) + \mathcal{R}_j(x)\delta_{,i}(x,y), \tag{79}$$

we take into account that $\mathcal{H}_i$ and $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_i$ commutes, and each of them satisfies Eq. (49), then (79) is valid. By straightforward calculations we get

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathcal{R}(x), \mathcal{R}(y)\} &= \left(\eta^{ij}\mathcal{R}_j + uu^i\mathcal{S} - (\eta^{ij} - u^2\gamma^{ij} - u^iu^j)\mathcal{S}_j + Q^i\right)(x)\delta_{,i}(x,y) - \\ &- \left(\eta^{ij}\mathcal{R}_j + uu^i\mathcal{S} - \left(\eta^{ij} - u^2\gamma^{ij} - u^iu^j\right)\mathcal{S}_j + Q^i\right)(y)\delta_{,i}(y,x) \approx \\ &\approx \left(\eta^{ij}\mathcal{R}_j + Q^i\right)(x)\delta_{,i}(x,y) - \left(\eta^{ij}\mathcal{R}_j + Q^i\right)(y)\delta_{,i}(y,x), \end{aligned} \tag{80}$$

and also,

$$\begin{aligned} \{\mathcal{R}_i(x), \mathcal{R}(y)\} &= \mathcal{R}(x)\delta_{,i}(x,y) + u_{,i}\mathcal{S}\delta(x,y) + \\ &+ \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}\left(Q_i^j(x)\delta(x,y)\right) + \\ &+ \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}\left(u^j\mathcal{S}_i(x)\delta(x,y)\right) + u_{,i}^j\mathcal{S}_j\delta(x.y) \approx \\ &\approx \mathcal{R}(x)\delta_{,i}(x,y) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}\left(Q_i^j(x)\delta(x,y)\right), \end{aligned} \tag{81}$$

where simpler expressions arise after taking into account constraint equations $\mathcal{S} \approx 0$ and $\mathcal{S}_i \approx 0$. Quantities

$$Q_k^i = 2\eta_{jk}\frac{\partial\tilde{U}}{\partial\eta_{ij}} + 2\gamma_{jk}\frac{\partial\tilde{U}}{\partial\gamma_{ij}} - u^i\frac{\partial\tilde{U}}{\partial u^k} - \delta_k^i\tilde{U}, \tag{82}$$

$$Q^\ell = 2u^j\gamma_{jk}\frac{\partial\tilde{U}}{\partial\gamma_{k\ell}} - u^\ell u\frac{\partial\tilde{U}}{\partial u} + \left(\eta^{k\ell} - u^2\gamma^{k\ell} - u^ku^\ell\right)\frac{\partial\tilde{U}}{\partial u^k}, \tag{83}$$

should be equal to zero in order $\mathcal{R}$, $\mathcal{R}_i$ to be first class constraints.

As has been observed in articles [20, 15], Eq. (81) becomes simpler if one add to $\mathcal{R}_i$ a combination of primary constraints:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_i = \mathcal{R}_i + \pi_u u_{,i} + \pi_{u^k} u^k{}_{,i} + (\pi_{u^i} u^k)_{,k}, \tag{84}$$

then we obtain

$$\{\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_i(x), \mathcal{R}(y)\} = \mathcal{R}(x)\delta_{,i}(x,y) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x^j}\left(Q_i^j(x)\delta(x,y)\right), \tag{85}$$

but with the replacement of $\mathcal{R}_i$ for $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_i$ the primary constraints appear in Eq. (80).

B Solving $\mathcal{S}_i$ constraints

Second class constraints may be used not only for deriving of Dirac brackets, but also for straightforward exclusion of conjugate variables (u, π_u) and (u^i, π_{u^i}) from the Hamiltonian. When the chosen potential is simple enough (see, for example, [37]), it is possible to express 3 functions u^i (or $g^{\perp i}$) through the rest variables after solving constraints

$$\bar{\mathcal{H}}_i + \partial\tilde{U}/\partial u^i = 0. \tag{86}$$

Given these solutions

$$u^k = \bar{u}^k(u, \eta_{ij}, \gamma_{ij}, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_i), \tag{87}$$

and then substituting them into constraint $\bar{\mathcal{H}} + \partial\tilde{U}/\partial u = 0$, we can express also u (or $g^{\perp\perp}$) as a function of the rest variables

$$u = \bar{u}(\eta_{ij}, \gamma_{ij}, \bar{\mathcal{H}}(\gamma_{ij}, \pi^{ij}, \phi_A, \pi^A)). \tag{88}$$

It is stated that for potential of a special form proposed and studied in articles [6, 9] it is impossible to solve the secondary constraints (74) and express u as a function (88). As above, we suppose that potential $\tilde{U}$ has such a property that 3 constraints $\mathcal{S}_i$ can be solved for variables u^k, matrix $||L_{ij}||$ is invertible in this case. By substituting these solutions back into equations $\mathcal{S}_i = 0$ we evidently get identities, and then

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial u}\,\mathcal{S}_i|_{u^k=\bar{u}^k} \equiv 0, \tag{89}$$

or equivalently,

$$\frac{\partial^2\tilde{U}}{\partial u \partial u^i} + \frac{\partial^2\tilde{U}}{\partial u^i \partial u^k}\frac{\partial\bar{u}^k}{\partial u} = 0. \tag{90}$$

From this we find

$$\frac{\partial \bar{u}^k}{\partial u} = -(L^{-1})^{k\ell}\frac{\partial^2 \tilde{U}}{\partial u \partial u^\ell} = -\bar{U}^k \qquad \frac{\partial \bar{u}^k}{\partial \bar{\mathcal{H}}_i} = -\left(L^{-1}\right)^{ik}, \tag{91}$$

$$\frac{\partial \bar{u}^k}{\partial \eta_{mn}} = -\left(L^{-1}\right)^{ik}\frac{\partial^2 \tilde{U}}{\partial u^i \partial \eta_{mn}}, \qquad \frac{\partial \bar{u}^k}{\partial \gamma_{mn}} = -\left(L^{-1}\right)^{ik}\frac{\partial^2 \tilde{U}}{\partial u^i \partial \gamma_{mn}}. \tag{92}$$

Next, after substitution of the derived expressions $u^k = \bar{u}^k(u, \eta_{ij}, \gamma_{ij}, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_i)$ into the forth constraint, we get an expression, which according to supposition made in articles [6, 9] does not depend on u:

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{reduced}} = \bar{\mathcal{H}} + \left.\frac{\partial \tilde{U}}{\partial u}\right|_{u^k=\bar{u}^k}, \tag{93}$$

and then

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{S}_{\text{reduced}}}{\partial u} = \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{U}}{\partial u^2} + \frac{\partial \bar{u}^i}{\partial u}\frac{\partial^2 \tilde{U}}{\partial u \partial u^i} = \hat{D}\frac{\partial \tilde{U}}{\partial u} = 0. \tag{94}$$

In order to commute the constraints we can use equivalently the canonical Poisson brackets instead of Dirac brackets, if we take into account dependence given by Eq. (87).

C Analysis of bigravity with Lagrangian multipliers method

Apart from the two methods used above (Dirac brackets construction in Section 3 and solving of constraints in Appendix B) there is an approach based on calculation of Lagrangian multipliers. Here we start with the Hamiltonian containing all primary constraints with their Lagrangian multipliers, i.e. functions which should to be varied to get constraints as equations of motion, but which have zero Poisson brackets with any variable,

$$\mathrm{H} = \int \left(N\mathcal{R} + N^i\mathcal{R}_i + \lambda\pi_u + \lambda^i\pi_{u^i}\right). \tag{95}$$

Then we check for consistency of 4 primary constraints

$$\dot{\pi}_u = \{\pi_u, \mathrm{H}\} = \int d^3x N\{\pi_u, \mathcal{R}\} = -\frac{\partial \mathcal{R}}{\partial u} = -N\mathcal{S} = 0, \tag{96}$$

$$\dot{\pi}_{u^i} = \{\pi_{u^i}, \mathrm{H}\} = \int d^3x N\{\pi_{u^i}, \mathcal{R}\} = -\frac{\partial \mathcal{R}}{\partial u^i} = -N\mathcal{S}_i = 0, \tag{97}$$

and get 4 secondary constraints

$$\mathcal{S} \approx 0, \qquad \mathcal{S}_i \approx 0. \tag{98}$$

We should not add secondary constraints to the Hamiltonian, but we are to check their evolution equations for consistency

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\mathcal{S}} &= \int N\{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{R}\} + N^k\{\mathcal{S},\mathcal{R}_k\} + \lambda\{\mathcal{S},\pi_u\} + \lambda^k\{\mathcal{S},\pi_{u^k}\} = 0, &(99)\\
\dot{\mathcal{S}}_i &= \int N\{\mathcal{S}_i,\mathcal{R}\} + N^k\{\mathcal{S}_i,\mathcal{R}_k\} + \lambda\{\mathcal{S}_i,\pi_u\} + \lambda^k\{\mathcal{S}_i,\pi_{u^k}\} = 0, &(100)
\end{aligned}$$

where omitting δ-function we can write

$$\{\mathcal{S}_i,\pi_{u^k}\} = L_{ik}, \quad \{\mathcal{S}_i,\pi_u\} = \tilde{U}_i = \{\mathcal{S},\pi_{u^i}\}, \quad \{\mathcal{S},\pi_u\} = \tilde{U}''. \tag{101}$$

As L_{ik} is invertible matrix we can solve Eq. (100) for λ^k

$$\lambda^k = -\lambda\bar{U}^k - (L^{-1})^{kj}\left(N\{\mathcal{S}_j,\mathcal{R}\} + N^i\{\mathcal{S}_j,\mathcal{R}_i\}\right), \tag{102}$$

and then substitute this into Eq. (99). Evidently, multiplier λ is canceled due to Eq. (31), and therefore Eq. (99) is a new constraint (compare with Eq. (55)):

$$\dot{\mathcal{S}} \approx N\Omega \approx 0, \qquad \text{or} \qquad \Omega \approx 0. \tag{103}$$

Next step is to check a consistency of this last constraint

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\Omega} &= \int N\{\Omega,\mathcal{R}\} + N^k\{\Omega,\mathcal{R}_k\} + \lambda\{\Omega,\pi_u\} + \lambda^k\{\Omega,\pi_{u^k}\} = \\
&= \int N\left[\{\Omega,\mathcal{R}\} - \{\Omega,\pi_{u^i}\}(L^{-1})^{ij}\{\mathcal{S}_j,\mathcal{R}\}\right] + \\
&+ N^i\left[\{\Omega,\mathcal{R}_i\} - \{\Omega,\pi_{u^k}\}(L^{-1})^{kj}\{\mathcal{S}_j,\mathcal{R}_i\}\right] + \\
&+ \lambda\left[\{\Omega,\pi_u\} - \bar{U}^i\{\Omega,\pi_{u^i}\}\right] = \\
&= \int N\{\Omega,\mathcal{R}\}_{\tilde{D}} + N^i\{\Omega,\mathcal{R}_i\}_{\tilde{D}} + \lambda\{\Omega,\pi_u\}_{\tilde{D}} \approx 0. &(104)
\end{aligned}$$

We can see from Eq. (57) that the last Dirac bracket is proportional to Θ^i, so it is zero. Then Eq. (104) gives a new constraint. As Ω is a spatial scalar we have

$$\{\Omega,\mathcal{R}_k\}_{\tilde{D}} \approx 0, \tag{105}$$

and therefore the new condition is as follows

$$\int N\{\Omega, \mathcal{R}\}_{\tilde{D}} = \Psi \approx 0. \tag{106}$$

Next we should check

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\Psi} &= \{\Psi, \mathrm{H}\} = \int N\{\Psi, \mathcal{R}\} + N^k\{\Psi, \mathcal{R}_k\} + \lambda\{\Psi, \pi_u\} + \lambda^k\{\Psi, \pi_{u^k}\} = \\ &= \int N\{\Psi, \mathcal{R}\}_{\tilde{D}} + N^k\{\Psi, \mathcal{R}_k\}_{\tilde{D}} + \lambda\{\Psi, \pi_u\}_{\tilde{D}} = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{107}$$

As, according to Eqs. (70), (71),

$$\{\Psi, \pi_u\}_{\tilde{D}} \neq 0, \tag{108}$$

then Eq. (107) can be solved for λ and the analysis of constraints is finished.